

P A 3 $\frac{10 \text{ Jan}^{\text{th}}}{1}$

701
5

LETTER

TO

Dr. BENNET,

Occasion'd by his Late

TREATISE

Concerning the

NON-JURORS

SEPARATION, &c.

By JAMES PEIRCE.

The Second Edition.

LONDON:

Printed for JOHN CLARK, at the Bible
and Crown in the Poultry, near Cheap-
side. 1717.

Price Six Pence.

LETTER

TO

DEAR MARY

TRAVELLERS

YOUNG LADIES

STUDENTS

BY JAMES H. HARRIS

NEW YORK

Published by the Author

at No. 10, NASSAU ST.

NEW YORK



S I R,



WHEN your Treatise, concerning the *Non-jurors* Separation came abroad, my Curiosity made me take the first convenient Opportunity I could get to read it. I had a great Desire to see how a Person who had writ earnestly against the Dissenters about Schism, would deal with the *Non-jurors* upon that Head. And, to say the Truth, I was fancying with my self before hand, that this new Turn, given to the Controversy about Schism, might occasion your more thorough examining it; and letting fall, perhaps, somewhat or other, that might be for my Edification and Comfort, as a Dissenter. How I have gratified my Expectation and profited by your Performance, you will perceive by this Letter address'd to yourself, as a thankful Acknowledgment.

THE Quarrel lying so intirely among the Abettors of Episcopacy, I had hopes, the Dissenters might have stood by as Spectators without giving any Offence. But your Preface soon convinc'd me, your angry Resentments against the Dissenters, who have given you no new Provocation, are not to be forgotten, even when

you are Writing against our common Enemies, for such the *Non-jurors* must be, if the Establish'd Church are as true Friends, as the Dissenters, to the present GOVERNMENT.

I SAW you were angry, when you crowded us into a *Parentbesis* with the *Papists*, and bestow'd upon us the abusive Name of *Fanatics*, and represented us as *sneering* at your Folly, and *rejoycing* in your *Breaches*. However, I resolv'd to keep my Temper, and make Allowances for your Education in a Party that does not use to be over-mannerly to their Neighbours, when they differ from them. And indeed, considering how much worse Treatment we have formerly been forc'd to endure, a little opprobrious Language may well be born with Patience, and we have great Reason to be thankful to a Good God, who restrains our Enemies from going further.

THE Dissenters are too well known for their *Charity*, to be easily thought to *rejoyce* in *Iniquity*. They are heartily sorry the Nation should be so divided about the Title of our only Lawful and Rightful Sovereign King GEORGE. And you, Sir, are too wise an Observer of Affairs, not to be sensible, they have Reason, above all Men, to be sorry upon this Account, since the Consequences of the Division have fallen heavily upon them; when the *Papists* were join'd with another Sort of People, who more justly deserv'd the Name of *Fanatics* in plundering their Houses and Temples, and a great many, besides *Non-jurors*, were *sneering* at the noble Exploit. The Truth is, tho' we are sorry for the Wickedness we see in any Party; yet we cannot but observe, and admire the wise Conduct of Providence; that those Gentlemen who were formerly so eager in charging us with Schism, and persecuting us for it, should now fall out with one another upon the same Head. We hope indifferent Judges will

will now look upon the old Clamours against us, to have proceeded rather from the Temper of the Men, than any Desert on our Part. Besides, we flatter ourselves, that God will by this Means give our Adversaries some Light into this Business of Schism, which certainly will do very well to accompany the Heat with which they use to treat it. And, 'tis possible, the Justice of our Plea, in our own Behalf, may, upon this Occasion, be more easily discern'd, by those who have hitherto been backward to hear any Thing in our Favour. 'Tis likely the Dissenters have not been Stoical enough to forbear smiling a little (which you call *sneering*) at your Conduct. But as the *Folly* of that Conduct is own'd, so you know, Sir, there is somewhat ridiculous in *Folly*, that is apt to move Men of the greatest Gravity. I make it therefore my humble Request, That you will hereafter, in Compassion to the common Infirmary (if it be an Infirmary) of Mankind, forbear insulting us, if you see we are guilty of any Thing of this Nature.

GIVE me leave to take Notice of one Passage more in your Preface, relating partly to the Dissenters: 'Tis this; *And have we not always told the Dissenters, That Schism is a most damnable Sin? Surely therefore 'tis by no Means an indifferent Thing, whether we resort to the Publick or to the Private Assemblies, (which do each of them claim the venerable Name of the Church of England) for there is assuredly great Hazard of Salvation on one Side or other.* I only desire, you would here reflect upon the different Manner, in which the Dissenters and the Non-jurors are treated. When the poor Dissenters are to be run down, then *Schism is a most damnable Sin*: But when the Non-jurors are to be confuted, how is the Matter minced? 'Tis *by no Means an indifferent Thing*; and there is assuredly great Hazard of Salvation on one Side or other. Why all this Tenderness

derness now in one Case rather than the other? If Schism be what you have told the Dissenters 'tis, Why should it not be the same in the Case of the Nonjuring Schismatics? Why should not they be told as plainly as the Dissenters, that they are guilty of a most damnable Sin? I grant your Expression does not import your being in Doubt on which Side the Hazard lies, because you afterward charge the Schism on the *Non-jurors*; yet it shews you are not over free to speak out in their Case. Is this equal Dealing, supposing we and they are both chargeable with Schism? Indeed Tenderness to the *Non-jurors* may not be the only Cause of this. For your Principles must unavoidably force you to give up all the Dioceses of the Bishops that succeeded those who were depriv'd for Schismatics, as long as those depriv'd Bishops liv'd; so that 'tis likely here was somewhat of a Tenderness for the Establish'd Church. Further, How very soft is your Way of speaking of their Assemblies? They are no otherwise distinguish'd from those of the Parish-Churches, than as *Private Assemblies* from *Publick Ones*, each of them *claiming the venerable Name of the Church of England*. How different does the Style use to be, when our Assemblies are mention'd? Conventicles, or any other disgraceful Terms, will serve well enough upon that Occasion. 'Tis easy to see both by the *Preface* and the Beginning of your Treatise, the Reason of this different Treatment, is their Affection to Episcopacy and the Common Prayer. But can you think we are guilty of a greater Crime by being against both these, so far as we are against them, than they are in endeavouring to bring in the *Pretender*? Could they have brought him in, without entailing *Po-pery* and *Slavery* upon this Nation, and endangering the Protestant Religion through the whole World? And are Liberty, Property, and the Pro-
testant

testant Religion of less Value than Episcopacy and the English Liturgy? Nay, would not the Success of their Attempt have robb'd you of the Liturgy it self?

I COME now to your Book, in the first Chapter of which I shall only take Notice of one Passage, which is the great Design of the whole Chapter. † I think it necessary to fix the Scene of this Dispute (if I may so speak) in some one particular Diocese; there being certainly a considerable Diversity, 1. Between the Case of the Province of Canterbury and that of the Province of York. 2. Between the Case of those Dioceses whose Bishops were depriv'd for refusing the Oaths to King William and Queen Mary, and those Dioceses whose Bishops took the said Oaths, and were consequently suffer'd to continue in their Sees. Whereupon you fix on London, the Diocese you belong to, wherein the Strength of the Non-jurors Communion lies.

NOW I would not contest your fixing the Scene of the Dispute, were it not that I apprehend you have thereby a little alter'd the State of it. I shall submit my Reasons to your Judgment.

I. THE Diocese of London, seems to me, too narrow a Scene for this Dispute, according to your own Account of Schism, which is the Matter of it. You tell us: * *Schism is a Breach of that Union, which ought to be maintain'd in the Christian Church or Society.* This Definition I have always look'd upon to be the most exact: But your fixing London as the Scene, seems to be a waving the Consideration of any other than an internal Schism in that Diocese. But is a Christian then, who lives in London, oblig'd only to consider, how he may maintain the Union of that Diocese? Is there not an Union, which that whole Diocese is to cultivate with others, and a Schismatical

Breach of which it may be guilty ? You need not be told, how often the contrary has been urged upon the Dissenters, who have been charg'd with Schism, not only for breaking the Union of a Diocesan and the Catholic Church ; but likewise for breaking the Union which ought to be in the National Church. Mens leaving their own particular Church was then reckon'd an Irregularity, but not a Schism, if they communicated with the National Church.

II. THIS fixing the Scene of the Dispute does not suit your own Account of that Church, in which this Schism is. For thus in the Beginning of your Book you define the Church, from which you afterwards tell us this Separation and Schism is made : * *By the Church of England, is meant that Body of Christians (Clergy and Laity) who profess themselves Members of that Communion, which is maintain'd amongst us under the Government of Bishops, and by the Use of the Book of Common Prayer.* So that the Schism is consider'd with Relation to this whole National Church. Thus likewise you say in your Preface : *There is undoubtedly a Schism between those who pretend an equal Affection, and the warmest Zeal for our Holy Mother.* Who then is this *Holy Mother* ? Is it the Diocese of London, or the Province of Canterbury ? Is it not plainly the National Church ? Don't you reckon, the whole Church of England, consisting of both Provinces, makes but one Communion ? Is there not therefore a Schism from the whole Church, when there is a Schism from any one Part, Diocese or Province thereof ? Can there be a Schism in the Province of Canterbury, and the whole Church of England not be affected with it ? That is, Can there be in the Province of Canterbury

bury opposite Societies, renouncing Communion with each other; and yet both of them be united to the Province of *York*, in order to make up the one *Church of England*? Every Diocese therefore in both Provinces must necessarily be concern'd in the Schism that happens in any Diocese of either of them: And the Scene of the Dispute should have been as wide as the National Church. A Mistake in this Matter runs thro' your whole Treatise. You endeavour to shew, How independent Dioceses may be schismatically separated from one another, without their being either of them cut off from the Catholic Church: But you never attempt to prove, what you principally ought, That Dioceses, which are join'd together in one National Communion, may be schismatically separated from each other, and yet neither of them be separated from that National Communion.

III. YOUR Scene does not suit the Head of the Church, the Centre of her Unity, according to her Constitution. The two Provinces make one Church, by being join'd together under one Prince, the Head of the National Church. There can be no other Centre or Principle of National Unity besides the King. But the Narrowness of your Scene makes you very defective about this Point. For you never attempt to make it out, That two Bishops, which acknowledge and adhere each of them to a different Head, can be both join'd together in Communion in one National Church.

IV. IF the *Non-jurors* should be so complaisant to you as to set aside the Consideration of the Province of *York*, yet your Scene is too narrow for the Province of *Canterbury*. For do not all the several Dioceses of the Province of *Canter-*

bury make up one Provincial Church? Are you not persuaded that there ought to be such an Union? How then can there be a Breach in the Union of these Dioceses, and yet they all concur to make one Provincial Church?

V. NOR does your Scene suit the Archbishop of *Canterbury*, the Centre and Principle of the Unity of that Provincial Church. Is not the Archbishop of *Canterbury* the Head of this Provincial Church? Are not all the Bishops and Dioceses therein one, by being all united to him as their Head? Think you not, that it ought to be so? Can then any Bishop in the Province separate from the Archbishop, and yet continue one with him? Or could there be two opposite Archbishops, Dr. *Sancroft*, and Dr. *Tillotson*, and the Bishops, who adher'd, some to one, some to the other, be in Communion as Members of the same Provincial Church?

YOUR second Chapter is design'd to prove,
 * *That Dr. Compton continued rightful Bishop of London to the Day of his Death.* You argue he did not cease to be Bishop of *London* by a voluntary Resignation; which I grant: Nor by Deprivation; which will be spoke to where you more expressly consider it: Nor by any Forfeiture; and this I shall now examine. But you say, *even this cannot be pretended.* For, 1. He did not forfeit it before the Deprivation of the Non-juring Bishops. This appears from those very Bishops avowed Communion with him, as Bishop of *London*, to the very Date of their Deprivation. Nor, 2. Did he forfeit it after their Deprivation. For what did he do inconsistent with the Right to his See? If it were granted, that his having taken the Oaths to King William and Queen Mary, and his Allowance of the Alteration
 of

of the Liturgy throughout his Diocese, were base and sinful Compliances ; yet he did not thereby forfeit his Episcopal Relation to us. For if those Actions were a Forfeiture of his See ; then his See was forfeited immediately after the Revolution. Your Inference from the Practice of the Nonjuring Bishops is too large. It ought to be no more than this, that Dr. C. did not, in the Opinion of the Nonjuring Bishops at that time, forfeit his See. The Nonjuring Bishops might, in their great Charity, hold Communion with him as Bishop of London longer than they ought to have done. And 'tis not their Practice, but the Reason of the Thing, that must determine, whether he had forfeited his See, or no. The *Non-jurors* therefore may easily answer, Dr. Compton forfeited his See, when he was guilty of what, according to the Canons of the Church, is a Forfeiture. There is a Mistake that runs thro' your whole Argument ; That you think there is no Forfeiture, 'till there be a Sentence of Deprivation. Now certainly, the Forfeiture is made as soon as a Man is guilty of what deserves the Sentence. I believe this one Argument will prove my Assertion : A Forfeiture must be a Person's own Act, whereas the Sentence is the Act of the Judge. A Murderer forfeits his own Life as soon as he has committed the Murder ; the Judge does not forfeit it for him, when he passes Sentence ; the Sentence being only a Declaration of the Forfeiture, which the Murderer himself has made, according to the Sense of the Law. And unless you allow what I say, I cannot imagine, what Distinction you will make between a Deprivation, and a Forfeiture.

PERHAPS I may best satisfy you, that your Argument will not hold, by applying it to prove somewhat you dislike. For Instance ; we all agree in charging the Church of Rome with Schism ; and say the Communion of her Bishops is to be

avoided as Schismatical. But how easy is it for a Romanist, to use your Way of arguing, to prove the contrary? If the popish Bishops by their Schism forfeited their Right to their Dioceses, and to the Obedience of Christians who belong'd to them, they forfeited it either before, or after the *Reformation*: Not before the *Reformation* for 'till the very *Reformation*, the Persons, who were afterward Protestant Bishops, held Communion with them; not after the *Reformation*, for what did they after it, which they did not before, when your own Bishops held Communion with them, or that was inconsistent with their Right to their Sees? &c. But if it will be less offensive to you, I will apply your Argument to the Case of the Ministers ejected in 1662. If these Ministers, say I, forfeited their Livings, they must do it either before or after *Bartholomew-day*: Not before, because several of your own Bishops held Communion with them 'till that very Day; not after, for what did they after, that they did not before, or that was inconsistent with their Right to their Livings?

FURTHER, tho' your Argument may seem very subtil, yet I fear, it will hardly convince the *Non-jurors*. For when they pretend Dr. C. forfeited his See by Schism, may they not well be suppos'd to say, the Schism was not fully form'd before the actual Deprivation of the Bishops? And may they not give a plausible Reason at least for the *Non-jurors* continuing in Communion with those that took the Oaths till that time? 'Till the Deprivation, Dr. *Sancroft*, and the rest of the Non-juring Bishops, may be suppos'd to have been waiting for an Opportunity of proceeding against Dr. *Compton*, from which they were hinder'd by the State of publick Affairs; and so they continued Communion with him, as the Church does with notorious Offenders,

ders, till their Process is finish'd, and they are judicially excommunicated. But at the Deprivation the Case is quite alter'd, and the Communion is actually broken. There is then some new Guilt on one or the other Side, that breaks the Communion at the very Deprivation; and if it lies on Dr. *Compton's* Side, he may, notwithstanding your Argument, at the Deprivation forfeit his See.

OR again, Dr. *Sancroft*, and those of his Side, might possibly think the taking of the Oaths to King *William* and Queen *Mary* was not such a Sin as should immediately make them break Communion with Dr. *Compton*. They might apprehend too, that to insist so rigorously upon the Canons of the Church was at that time unseasonable; and considering what Hand they had in the Prince of *Orange's* coming over, this may not seem improbable. Now this will justify, or at least excuse their holding Communion with Dr. *Compton*, till the Deprivation. But the Case then becomes intirely different: The Question is not any longer, whether Dr. *Compton's* taking the Oaths is so great a Sin as should make Dr. *Sancroft* avoid his Communion? But whether Dr. *Sancroft's* not taking the Oaths is such a grievous Sin, that 'tis become lawful for Dr. *Compton* to break Communion with him, and join with an opposite Archbishop, set up in his Room? Before the Deprivation, the Bishops might each enjoy his own Opinion without breaking Communion; but then the Schism was form'd by Dr. *Compton's* leaving the Communion of the Bishops, which the *Non-jurors* say, and you in your Argument allow, were unjustly depriv'd. And indeed Dr. *Compton* must be consider'd in his relation to the Provincial Church of *Canterbury*; and the Question is, Which were the Rightful Bishops of that Provincial Church after the Deprivation? For
if

if Dr. *Sancroft* and his Party were the Bishops of that provincial Church, then Dr. *Compton* forfeited his being a Bishop of that provincial Church; unless he could at the same time be a Bishop of two opposite provincial Churches in the same Province.

You next proceed to prove, Dr. *Compton* did not forfeit his Diocese by * *maintaining Communion with those Bishops, who were placed in the Sees of the deprived ones.* And here you make them Three as large Concessions, as they can well desire.
 † 1. *That the late Revolution was utterly unjustifiable, and that the Settlement consequent upon it was utterly null.* 2. *That the Bishops who were depriv'd for not submitting to it were Confessors for their Refusal; and that those Bishops who were placed in their Sees were schismatical Intruders.* 3. *That Dr. Compton, then Bishop of London, was guilty of Schism in maintaining Communion with those schismatical Intruders.* -

I DOUBT not the *Non-jurors* will give you a great many Thanks for these Concessions, and think you have shorten'd the Controversy with a witness. But I am very much mistaken, if the whole Bench of Bishops will reckon themselves much oblig'd to you, for giving them up as a Parcel of Schismatics. I am very sure the Government have no Reason to take it kindly of you, to leave them thus in the lurch. For 'tis evident, you don't attempt to make the Government one Friend more than it has already. The Design of your Concessions and all your arguing upon them, is to strengthen your Church by the Addition of those whom you allow to continue Enemies to the Government. This I apprehend is a real
 Disservice

Differvice to the GOVERNMENT, tho' I do not charge you with any such Intentions. Certainly the Enemies of our present happy State, who lurk in the Church, are much more dangerous than the *Non-jurors*, who profess their Principles, and may be more easily watch'd, and kept from doing Mischief. Besides, tho' you pretend to make these Concessions to *shorten the Controversy*; yet the Reader must be very careless, who does not see, you don't herein act upon that single Consideration. Half these Concessions appear, by what you say afterward, to be no other than your own settled Principles. The latter Half of your second Concession, *That those Bishops who were plac'd in their [the deprived Bishops] Sees, were schismatical Intruders*, must be your own Judgment, because you affirm; * *That till a Bishop is depos'd by a proper Judicature, he no more ceases to be Bishop of his See by being guilty of the Schism of Co-ordination, than he ceases to be Bishop of his See, by being a Drunkard, or guilty of any other enormous Vice.* That is, he never ceases to be Bishop of his Diocese for any Crime, till he is depos'd by a proper Judicature; and just before you let us know, you take a Synod to be the proper Judicature. So that since the *Non-juring Bishops* were never depos'd by a Synod, they did not cease to be Bishops of their Sees, and they who came in their Room were, according to your own, as well as the *Non-jurors* Principles, *schismatical Intruders*. And hence 'twill follow, that your third Concession is likewise your own Opinion, *That Dr. Compton, then Bishop of London, was guilty of Schism in maintaining Communion with those schismatical Intruders.* Now, is it not natural for a Man to suspect, that as 'tis evident one Half of the Concessions you pretend

tend to make to shorten the Controversy, are no other than your own Sentiments ; so the other Half may very possibly be so too. I am confident the *Non-jurors* will understand you so, and think you agree with them in their grand Principle, *That the Revolution was utterly unjustifiable, and the Settlement consequent upon it null ; and that the Bishops who were depriv'd for not submitting to it, were Confessors for their Refusal.* They will be apt to think, you save your Submission to the Present GOVERNMENT by the Help of some such subtil Evasion, as you would have them use in submitting to one, whom they esteem a schismatical Bishop. You know, Sir, how apt they are to give an invidious Turn to any Thing, and it can do you no Hurt to guard against such a Charge, which to say the Truth, your Words, as they now lie, give too much Occasion for, 'till you clear yourself by an express Declaration of the contrary ; and that is soon made, without any great matter of Trouble.

HAVING made these Concessions ; you add, *I dare say, these Concessions will be esteem'd large enough o' Conscience :* Doubtless they will ; I don't suppose the *Non-jurors* will desire more. *And I bid the Nonjurors heartily welcome to all the advantages they can draw from them.* The Prudence of this Expression, may perhaps deserve your second Thoughts. You can't but be sensible, that your Way of Arguing, after you have made these Concessions, is wonderfully nice and fine ; and tho' you may be fully persuaded, as I doubt not you are, that 'tis just and clear ; yet where there is so much Nicety in the Argument, a small Flaw, that will spoil it, may slip a Man's Observation ; and it would possibly have been time enough to bid your Adversaries welcome to all the Advantages they can draw from your Concessions, when upon Trial you should have found what they were. And
really

really the Revolution, and consequent Settlement, are too considerable for you to give them up to the Non-jurors in your nice Concessions, without making a Reserve for you after justifying them in case your Cause should need your doing so. But you go on:

For I still contend, that the aforesaid Dr. Compton continued our Bishop notwithstanding; and that his (supposed) Schismatical Communion with the (supposed) schismatical Intruders, was not a Forfeiture of his Right to his See. For the clearing this Assertion, you tell us: There is a wide Difference between the Schism of Co-ordination, and the Schism of Subordination. Dr. Compton's Schism, you say, was only of Co-ordination, that is, a Breach of that Peace he ought to have maintain'd with his Colleagues, who were his Equals. Now this I take to be a Mistake. Dr. Compton's was rather what you call a Schism of Subordination, it being between a Superior and an Inferior. According to the Constitution of the Church of England, an Archbishop is superior to all the Bishops in his Province; and unless he were so, I can't understand how the whole Province would make one Church. Nay, he has a Power over all the Bishops in his Province. The Author of *The Clergy-Man's Vade Mecum*, says, * "He has a Power of Visiting and Censuring all other Bishops within his Province. 'Tis lately disputed, Whether he can proceed to a Sentence of Deprivation or not? But yet we have seen such a Sentence take Effect." [He means, I suppose, the Case of Bishop Watson, depriv'd by Archbishop Tenison.] "† Upon Occasion, he appoints Coadjutors to other Bishops, if they grow infirm or disabled. — To him, in his Court of Arches, lie Appeals from the Courts of all other Bishops, and

C

Archdeacons

“ Archdeacons within his Province. ” * He may suspend any Bishop from Ordaining for two Years together upon his giving Orders contrary to the Laws of the Church. † He may restrain the Number of Apparitors in any Diocese; || and in many Cases a Bishop has not a Power to absolve a Person belonging to his Diocese, but the Absolution of the Archbishop is necessary. Nay, every Bishop, at his Consecration, professes and promises upon Oath all due Obedience and Reverence, to the Archbishop, and the Metropolitcal Church of N. and to their Successors. And as to the Bishop of London in particular, he is the Archbishop of Canterbury's Provincial Dean. So that there is a vast Difference between this Case and that of Independent Churches, which have no Relation one to another, but as they stand in a common Relation to the Catholic Church, and Christ the Head of it.

† Now a Bishop's being guilty of the Schism of Co-ordination, is by no means a Forfeiture of his See, any more than the Drunkenness, or Injustice, or other sinful Act or Habit of a Bishop, is a Forfeiture of it. I grant, that the Schism of Co-ordination may be most justly (and ought to be in some Cases) the Ground of a Bishop's Deprivation by Synodical Censure; and so may his Drunkenness, Injustice, or any other scandalous Crime. But I affirm, that till a Bishop is deposed by a proper Judicature, he no more ceases to be Bishop of his See by being guilty of the Schism of Co-ordination, than he ceases to be Bishop of his See by being a Drunkard, or being guilty of any other enormous Vice. For which Way can the Schism of Co-ordination dissolve the Relation between a Bishop and his Diocese? I beg leave to make a few Remarks upon this Passage.

I. THERE

IN **T**H**E**R**E** are two Assertions in it, which stand a little too near to one another, considering how inconsistent they seem to be. I mean these two; *That a Bishop's being guilty of the Schism of Consecration is by no means a Forfeiture of his See; and That it may be most justly (and ought indeed to be in some Cases) the Ground of a Bishop's Deprivation by Synodical Censure.* Certainly, according to what I observ'd before, whatever is most justly the Ground of a Bishop's Deprivation must amount to a Forfeiture of his See. A Synodical Censure is no Forfeiture. If 'twere, 'twould be always so; whereas if the Censure be causeless, there is no Forfeiture at all. How many were the Deprivations by Synodical Censure during the *Arian Controversy*? And yet no Man of any Side will think the Bishops, who were thus depriv'd, had always forfeited their Sees.

II. **Y**OU produce not any Reason for your laying so great a Stress upon a Synodical Censure. 'Tis not unlikely, the *Non-jurors*, against whom you are arguing, may allow much of this Power. But if the thing be consider'd in its own Nature, can you assert an absolute Necessity of their Concurrence? Must not the lodging this Power in Synods be the Result of Prudence rather than any Right which Synods could claim? Synods were look'd upon as indifferent Judges, to whom contending Parties might leave the Decision of their Quarrels. But if the Judgment of a Synod be so absolutely necessary, by a Right antecedent to the Agreement of Churches; I would fain know, by what Rule, antecedent to that Agreement, the Synods which are to have this Power are to be form'd. I take it for granted, that tho' you allow this Power to Oecumenical Synods, yet here you mean no other than National or Pro-

vincial Synods. But why must a Synod consist only of the Bishops of a Nation or a Province? Why has not the Bishop of another Province, if he can be present, as much Right to vote as any Bishop of that Province? If the Right of Synods is prior to any Compact of Churches, and all Bishops are equal, and each supreme and independent in his Diocese, the Consequence must be, that the Right of voting, concerning a Bishop, must equally belong to all the Bishops in the World.

III. It seems strange to me that nothing should be thought capable of dissolving a Bishop's Relation to his Flock, during his Life, without a formal Resignation, or a Synodical Censure. I should think a Bishop, by notoriously renouncing Christianity, was anciently reckon'd to depose himself, without either of those things; tho' your Way of expressing your self hardly leaves room for you to allow this. The Relation between a Bishop and his particular Flock, is founded upon a Contract; and certainly then he may be guilty of such an essential Violation of the Contract as shall dissolve the Relation. What Reason is there, why it should not be in this as well as other Relations, which have the like Foundation? 'Tis not unlikely, that some, at least, in the ancient Times might forsake the Communion of their Bishop upon his becoming notoriously wicked: But was there ever any Censure past upon such by any Synod, when they judg'd the Bishop's Wickedness amounted to a Forfeiture, or deserv'd Deprivation? I remember not, that ever I met with any such Instance.

IV. THIS Doctrine of yours (as I observ'd before) asserts the Right of the Nonjuring Bishops to their Sees after their Deprivation, (for they were never depos'd by Synodical Censure) and makes

makes their Successors schismatical Intruders. And this is now no longer a bare Concession, but must be look'd upon as your certain and avowed Principle. Which is such a notorious flying in the Face of the Government, that I cannot but think Prudence will make you forbear the like for the time to come.

V. I request you to consider, whether you have not, by this Doctrine, stabbed the Cause of your own Church to the very Heart. *Till a Bishop is depos'd by a proper Judicature, that is, 'till he is depriv'd by Synodical Censure, you say, he does not cease to be Bishop of his See;* I then infer the popish Bishops, depriv'd in the Beginning of Queen Elizabeth's Reign, continued the Rightful Bishops after their Deprivation; (for they were never depos'd by a proper Judicature, and indeed there was no Synod held 'till several Years after their Deprivation) and so the Protestant Bishops who were put in the Places of these popish depriv'd ones, were schismatical Intruders; and you have in your great Respect to the Church of England, as reform'd, made her Schismatical from her very Original. And this Case, you must own, reach'd to both Provinces. All the Four Bishops of the Province of York were thus depriv'd, and so that became an intirely Schismatical Province; and no less than Fourteen of the Bishops of the Province of Canterbury were in the same Case. I am glad, Sir, you did not live in Queen Elizabeth's Days to publish your Doctrine, which might have created you a great deal of Trouble; for she was too touchy to have born it patiently.

VI. WILL you please to consider how many this Doctrine of yours will involve in the Guilt of Schism in Archbishop Abbot's Case? He was
sequester'd

sequester'd by the King's Commission without any Synodical Censure; and five Bishops (among whom *Laud* was one) were appointed to do, execute, and perform all and every those Acts, Matters, and Things any way touching or concerning the Power, Jurisdiction, or Authority of the said Archbishop, in matters Ecclesiastical, as amply, fully and effectually, to all Intents and Purposes, as the said Archbishop himself might have done. So that according to your own Doctrine, *Laud*, the Bishop of *Bath* and *Wells*, and the Bishops of *London*, *Durham*, *Rochester*, and *Oxford*, were all Schismatics for invading the Authority of the Archbishop, who was not Synodically depos'd. And, which perhaps may be worse than all the rest, King *Charles* the Martyr must himself become a Schismatic for granting the Commission.

VII. THIS Doctrine of yours will make sad Work in your Church, by bringing in one of the Bishops of the Province of *York*, viz, *Durham*, and two of the Province of *Canterbury*, I mean the late Bishop of *Rochester*, and one of the depriv'd Bishops, the Bishop of *Peterborough*, into a Schism. They all of them invaded the Authority of the late Bishop of *London* in governing his Diocese, and particularly in degrading Mr. *Samuel Johnson*; though his Lordship had no Synodical Censure pass'd upon him. So that for ought I see, the Anti-Bishops of *Peterborough* must have been both of them Schismatical.

VIII. IT WILL be impossible, according to this Doctrine, that a Bishop, whom the King of *England* favours, should forfeit his See by any Wickedness whatsoever. You say, no Bishop can be depriv'd but by a Synod: But according to the Constitution of the Church of *England*,

no Synod can act but by the King's Licence. Let him then but Countenance the Bishop, and not allow the Synod to act, and he shall keep in the Bishop as Rightful Bishop of the See, let him turn what he will, a Heathen, a Turk, or a Jew: Had such Doctrine been publish'd anciently, there would have been less Danger in it to the Christian Church; but in our state of Affairs 'tis most pernicious. When the Judging of Bishops was reserv'd anciently to Synods, no Matter could long remain undecided, nor could the Church long receive Damage by a wicked Bishop; because Synods were then in most places held at least twice a Year; whereas perhaps 'tis a Question whether our English Clergy are ever like to be in so good a Temper, as that it should be advisable to let them sit again.

I THINK, what I have said will sufficiently shew the Comparisons you have here used, do not come home to the Case; I therefore pass them over, and proceed to your third Chapter. Here you have said a great deal to stop the *Pretended Contagion of Schism*. I shall only take notice of one or two Places, where I think you mistake the Case, about which you are arguing.

THUS then you are pleas'd to reason: * *If the Inferior Clergy or Laity be guilty of the Schism of Subordination by withdrawing themselves from their Bishop's Obedience, by renouncing Communion with him, by gathering Congregations in Opposition to him, by obstructing or hindering his Administration, or the like; the Unity of the Diocese is broken, by such Persons receding from the Bishop, who is the Centre or Principle of it. But which way does a Bishop's being guilty of the Schism of Co-ordination make his own Flock recede from the Principle or Centre of Unity?*

Though

Though he is a Principle or Centre of Unity to them, with respect to the Government of his own District; yet he is not a Principle or Centre of Unity to them, with respect to other Districts, with the Administration and Government of which they have no concern. Christians are united to Christ, and to one another, by Virtue of their Baptism; and so long as our Baptismal Covenant remains firm and good, we certainly retain a Relation to Christ our Head, and to all our Fellow Members in other Dioceses, how quarrelsome soever our own Bishop may prove to the Bishops of neighbouring Sees. 'Tis indeed reasonable to allow, That a Schism between independent Bishops and Churches does not prove, that one or t'other of them must necessarily be out of the Catholic Church. Nor do I see what Answer can be given to the Reason you alledge to prove it; viz. That both Sides in the Schism may remain united to Christ the Head of the Catholic Church. But however I like your Discourse in other respects; yet I can't but tell you, I think it does not come home to the *Non-jurors* Case. The Question, as I conceive, is concerning a Schism not from the Catholic, but from a National or Provincial Church. Independent Churches, between whom there is a Schism, may both be one with the Catholic Church, because they may both hold the same Head of it; but if one of them denies CHRIST the Head of the Church, you must own she can't belong to the Catholic Church. Just so, I say, the Archbishop of *Canterbury* is the Head of the Provincial Church, the Principle and Centre of Provincial Unity; and therefore a Bishop of that Province, who disowns the rightful Archbishop, breaks the Unity of the Provincial Church; and so do they who join with him. And a Parochial Minister may as well maintain the Diocesan Unity, while he disowns his own Bishop; or a Parishioner may as well maintain the Diocesan Unity,

Unity, while he joins with a Minister who disowns his Bishop; as a Bishop can maintain the Provincial Unity, while he disowns his proper Metropolitan. I may likewise resemble this by Civil Matters, as you do in the latter End of the foregoing Chapter. 'Tis possible two distinct Corporations may earnestly contend and quarrel about their Rights and Privileges, and other Persons may correspond with, or aid and assist either Side, without any Breach of the National Unity; because they may at the same Time on both Sides inviolably preserve their Allegiance to their Prince; but in Case one Side renounces their Allegiance to their Prince, the Principle and Centre of National Unity, and declares for another Pretender, all that then join with them, aid or assist them, undoubtedly break the National Unity. In like Manner, is every One guilty of breaking the Provincial Unity, who joins with a Bishop, who disowns his rightful Archbishop, the Centre of that Unity, and joins with an opposite Archbishop. And I think what you say in the latter End of this Chapter is very remarkable. * *I confess, if those that continued in Communion with Dr. Compton were thereby oblig'd, by some explicit or implicit Action or Declaration to acknowledge the intruding Dr. Moore for Bishop of Norwich: Or, if the Publick Assemblies of the Church of England, in the Diocese of London, were held in Opposition to Dr. Lloyd's Authority, and in Defiance of his Right to the See of Norwich, or the like; then the Case had been very different.* I suppose, when you say, *the Case had been very different*, you mean, they had been then guilty of Schism. Now, Sir, if you will oblige me and the Non-jurors so far as to read over this Passage again, with only these

D small

small Alterations, putting Dr. Tillotson instead of Dr. Moore; Dr. Sancroft instead of Dr. Llod; and Archbishop of Canterbury instead of Bishop of Norwich; you will see the Case is as different as can be: And you must confess, That *those who continued in Communion with Dr. Compton, were thereby oblig'd, by some explicit or implicit Action or Declaration to acknowledge Dr. Tillotson for Archbishop of Canterbury; and that the Publick Assemblies of the Church of England, in the Diocese of London, were held in Opposition to Dr. Sancroft's Authority, and in Defiance to his Right to the See of Canterbury.* I suppose, you will oblige the *Non-jurors* as well as me, by informing us, how you can in this Case clear the Diocese of London of the Guilt of Schism, according to your own Principles.

BEFORE I proceed to your next Chapter, give me leave to observe to you, how well pleas'd we Dissenters are with much of your Discourse. For my own Part, I should not only thank you for it; but the *Non-jurors* for being the Occasion of it, if I apprehended it was out of Kindness to us.

I. YOUR Discourse will serve for a Sort of *Index expurgatorius* to Abundance of your Writers against us. You, Sir, are too well-vers'd in our Controversy, to need my telling you, what a deal of Pains has been taken to prove we cannot possibly be any Part of the Catholic Church, because we are separated from a true Part of it. This Argument has been manag'd with much Metaphysical Nicety; and the Gentlemen who used it, seem'd to triumph in it as a perfect Demonstration. The Catholic Church, say they, is one Body; the various Members of which it consists are all join'd to one another, and so form one Body; whoever therefore is separated from
any

any one true Part of the Church, is certainly cut off from the whole Body. But I hope, we shall never more be dunn'd with any of this Folly, since you so frankly acknowledge there may be a Schism, where both Sides remain in the Catholic Church, by Virtue of their being united to CHRIST the Head of it. Nay you are pleas'd to rally the Gentlemen who have talk'd after this wild rate. † *How often, say you, have we been told, That in the Primitive Times 'twas held for a Maxim, That he who was a Schismatic from one Sound Branch or Part of the Christian Church was esteem'd a Schismatic from the whole Christian Church, and was consequently deny'd Communion with the Christian Church, and shut quite out of it? And what strange Inferences have been drawn from thence, &c?* I hope all Writings of this Sort shall henceforth pass for waste Paper.

II. ANOTHER Point we gain by your Discourse is, That we are not to be charg'd with Schism for separating from the National Church, but only for separating from the Diocesan Church wherein we dwell. If every Diocese is such an Independent Church, as your Argument represents it, this must be the Consequence. Now this will put an End to a great many Clamours, which have been rais'd against us.

III. YOU offer very fair to satisfy the Dissenters, there is no other than a Schism of Co ordination between them, and the Diocesan Churches. For not to mention their being convinc'd, upon great Evidence, that Presbyters and Bishops are equal; they can't see how the Secular Powers nominating a Person, and ordering his Consecration, should make him superior to his

D 2

Brethren

Brethren in Ecclesiastical Affairs ; especially since, as you know very well, all Bishops who were promoted this Way were to be depos'd, and those who communicated with them were to be excommunicated, according to the † *Apostolical Canons*, which Bp. Beveridge pretends, are very ancient.

IV. 'T IS possible the Dissenters may by this means clear themselves, and leave the Charge of Schism wholly upon their Co-ordinates or Equals. For if the Prelates can't be prov'd to have any Right to that spiritual Superiority they pretend to, little can be said, either to clear them of the Guilt of Schism, or to fix the Charge of it upon the Ministers ejected. For if they were their Equals in their Pastoral Relation to their Flocks, what was there in their Conduct that render'd them Schismatical? How could their not subscribing (even supposing they might lawfully have done it) forfeit their Pastoral Power? Or by what Right did the Prelates insist upon such Terms of Communion with their Equals? To which I might add ; they retain'd, for ought I see, their Right afterward, since they were never depriv'd but by a Civil Power, which I suppose, you will hardly allow to be a proper Judicature.

I COME now to your fourth Chapter, the Title of which is, * *Whether the Fathers of the Three first Centuries had any such Notion of the Contagion of Schism, as has been of late advanc'd.* And here you have not done yourself a greater Kindness than you have us, by confining your Enquiries* to the three first Centuries. You are sensible, how unmercifully we have been run down with the Cry of Antiquity, and what large and pompous Collections have

have been made out of it against us. But this Antiquity, that made such a Noise, was many times of so doubtful and uncertain a Sound, that 'twas not easy to know what was meant by it. We have been paid off with the Authorities of the Fourth and Fifth, and so on down to the Eleventh and Twelfth Centuries. We thought it a little hard to be forc'd to take so large a Compass in order to defend ourselves : And indeed, we must own, you had many Authorities in these Ages, especially the latest of them, on your Side. But you, Sir, we thank you, have reduc'd the Antiquity, that is worth disputing about, to a tolerable Size, and a Man need not fear to set about examining it. The only Antiquity you seem to allow any Authority to, is comprehended in the three first Ages. Thus when you appeal to them, you say, * *Those, I hope, will be thought sufficient ;* And again ; † *'Tis needless to examine the Practice of after-Ages.* Now this cuts off, at once, all the Authorities which are brought from after-Ages, as of no consequence in a Religious Controversy ; and so it may be of singular Use to shorten the Dispute, and ease Writers on both Sides. For this brings, in a manner, all the Dispute about Antiquity into the narrow Compass of Two Hundred Years. For as St. *John* liv'd beyond the End of the First Century, and we have no Dispute about the Authority of that Antiquity which is Apostolical ; so your Writers use to produce very little against us from the Genuine Writings of his Contemporaries, I mean *Clement, Barnabas* and *Hermas*. And indeed we pinch you as close with the Testimonies of the first of these and of the Holy Scriptures, as you do us sometimes with those of the Fourth and following Centuries. Now this Reduction of Antiquity I should have esteem'd

a

a great Favour ; but you are not content without going further, and retrenching half a Century more ; which, I assure you, exceedingly adds to the Obligation. I was extreamly pleas'd to find you cut off, at once, the Authority of *Cyprian that rigid Pattern*, as you call him, of *Ecclesiastical Discipline* ; who used to make a great Figure, I promise you, in your controversial Writers, and especially some who were most noisy in their Clamours about Schism. But here you speak out plainly, telling us, * *St. Cyprian was by no means infallible ; that his great Error about the Baptism of Heretics is notorious ; That 'tis certain, he did not either reason or think clearly upon the Nature of the Church.* But the noblest Passage of all is ; *Nor indeed shall I ever be afraid or ashamed to dissent from St. Cyprian, if I have Scripture and Reason, or either of them on my Side.* I profess, I can't tell what you could have said more frankly and generously concerning him. For I can never think you will grudge us that Liberty you take. We have therefore no other Antiquity left to trouble ourselves with, but only of about 150 Years, in which there were not very many Writers. And if your Writers will come no lower in seeking for Authorities, it may be an Ease to them as well as to us. But I can't help hoping, you will next time fling up the Authority of even those 150 Years ; and that so we shall come, according to the earnest desire of our Side, to acquiesce in Scripture and Reason as our *only Rule*. I can't perceive you will then pay any more than a decent Respect to Scripture and Reason ; or that any one will be able to charge you with disparaging the Authority of those Writers, more than *Cyprian's*.

I COME now to consider your Plea from the Antiquity of the three first Ages of the Church, which,

which, I suppose, you use rather in Complaisance to the *Non-jurors* Way of arguing, than because of any great Stress you think ought to be laid upon it. Here then to shew there is no Strength in the *Non-jurors* Argument from Antiquity, you say, † *Tho' 'tis very true, that the Primitive Church did most severely condemn Communion with Schismatical Bishops; yet it must be observ'd, that those Passages of Antiquity do universally relate to such Cases, where either the Flocks were Parties in the Schism, (for Instance, where there were opposite Bishops in the same Diocese; so that the one Party must certainly oppose the rightful Bishop) or else the Bishop of a neighbouring Diocese made himself a Party, and took the wrong Side in the Quarrel of two Bishops contending for the Right of the same See; and was consequently guilty of the Schism of Co-ordination, with respect to the injur'd Bishop.* These two Cases are very full to the *Non-jurors* Purpose. The first Case reaches evidently the Dioceses of all the deprived Bishops. For there *the Flocks must be Parties in the Schism, and one Party must certainly oppose the rightful Bishop.* Nay, it must reach the Case of the other Dioceses in the Province of Canterbury; where *the Flocks were Parties in the Schism, and there being opposite Archbishops, the one Party must certainly oppose the rightful Archbishop.* The second Case exactly falls in with that of all the Bishops who took the Oaths upon the *Revolution*: They all, according to your Concessions, *made themselves Parties, and took the wrong Side, and were guilty of the Schism of Co-ordination.* And certainly, this is very much to the *Non-jurors* Purpose, who do not artfully shift the Scene of this Dispute from what it naturally is: Nor is it wide even from your Purpose. But there is a third Case, which

I

I think you ought to have mention'd, because it has somewhat peculiar in it; tho' otherwise it may seem comprehended in your latter Case. 'Tis this; The Primitive Church did most severely condemn and depose as schismatical those Bishops, who ordained schismatical Anti-bishops, and they forbad all Communion with them. Now as you allow, those who came in the Room of the depriv'd Bishops were schismatical Intruders, you must likewise grant, that the Primitive Church would certainly have depos'd and forbid all Communion with their Ordainers. No One can deny this to have been the Sense of the Primitive Church, who has heard what they say of the Ordination of *Novatian*. Now as the Sense of the Ancients is here very clear, will you please to consider how this affects the Church of England? Beside those you call the schismatical Intruders, *viz.* the Archbishop of *Canterbury*, the Bishops of *Bath* and *Wells*, of *Ely*, *Norwich*, *Peterborough* and *Gloucester*, we must add those who were concern'd in the Ordination of any of them, that is, these Six more; the Bishops of *Winchester*, *St. Asaph*, *Salisbury*, *Worcester*, *Bristol* and *Oxford*. So that here are above half the Bishops of the Province of *Canterbury* all of them, according to the ancient Doctrine, downright Schismatics. And *Southwark* being in the Diocese of *Winchester*, there will be a Necessity of your fixing a new Scene of the Dispute, with reference to any Non-juring Assemblies on that Side *London-Bridge*.

I SHALL defer the Consideration of your Challenge, till I examine what you say of the Schism of *Marcianus*. The Point you undertake to prove is, † *That Antiquity does teach, that one Bishop may safely communicate with another Bishop who*

who is guilty of the Schism of Co-ordination, and that a Flock may safely continue in Communion with their Bishop, when he becomes guilty of that Crime; provided, to be sure, that they do not respectively join in the Schism of him whom they communicate with. Now here you alledge the famous Schism in Pope Victor's Days, when he excommunicated the Eastern Churches, upon a very impertinent Controversy concerning the Time of keeping *Easter*. I agree with you, here was a Schism, and that Pope Victor, and his Party, were the Schismatics. And I am heartily glad to see you produce this Instance, which must indeed, be a thorough Confutation of the damning Sentences which some have been so ready to pass upon all Schismatics, unless Men are so uncharitable as to think, that every Man of one or the other of these Parties was in a State of Damnation. However, I question, whether this will be sufficient fully to establish your Opinion about the Judgment of the ancient Christians, concerning the Contagion of Schism. For, 1. Victor and his Party must be reckon'd some of those Ancient Christians: And for ought appears, they might have such a Notion of the Contagion of Schism, when they excommunicated, at once, so many Bishops, together with all their Churches. And tho' you say, *The respective Flocks of Victor, and his schismatical Adherents, did not think themselves obliged to separate from their respective Diocesans, upon the Account of their being in a State of Schism of Co-ordination:* Yet I think, there is no Evidence, these Flocks had any Apprehension their Bishops were chargeable with the Schism; but they seem to have taken their Bishop's Part, and so heartily to have approv'd of what they did with an implicit Faith. 2. As to the Eastern Churches, we know little of their Sentiments in the Matter. We have no Account

E of

of the Schism but in *Eusebius*, who together with *Ireneus*, whose Fragment he has preserv'd, was of the Pope's Side as to the Time of keeping *Easter*, tho' they both dislik'd his Proceedings in excommunicating the Eastern Churches. But as to the Eastern Churches, we can't tell how they resented Pope *Victor's* Schism, and whether they thought it lawful, or no, to hold Communion with such as held Communion with these Schismatics. *Eusebius* has indeed preserv'd a Fragment of a Letter of *Polycrates*, who was one of them: But then that Letter was writ before *Victor's* excommunicating them, and so gives us no Light into this Matter. And therefore, 3, If we can gain any Light into their Notions upon this Occasion, it must be by considering the Practice of *Ireneus*, and other Western Bishops, who, as you say, in a most Christian Manner oppos'd the Pope's Party, without so much as pretending to break off Communion with his Schismatical Holiness. — They maintain'd Communion with both those opposite Parties, which refused to maintain Communion with each other. I doubt, whether it can be prov'd, that the Eastern Churches refus'd to maintain Communion with the other. But however, the Strength of your Argument lies upon the Behaviour of *Ireneus*, who maintain'd Communion with both Sides, and therefore could not have such a Notion of the Contagion of Schism. There are two Things which may take off much of the Force of the Argument. 1. Perhaps *Ireneus* might think the Matter was not gone far enough for him to break Communion with Pope *Victor*, whose Judgment he approv'd, while he condemn'd his rash Excommunication. The Apostle's Rule is: *A Man that is an Heretick, after the first and second Admonition reject.* † And, tho'

tho' *Ireneus* did not think, as I do, that he meant a Schismatic; yet 'tis very reasonable to suppose he apprehended this Rule was to be apply'd in the Case of * *Victor*, since he thought it to belong to those who were Heretics as well as Schismatics. Now this *Ireneus* was trying: He and the other Western Bishops were admonishing *Victor*, and remonstrating sharply against his Conduct; by which means, as you say, Peace was at length restor'd between the East and the West. 'Tis possible, had *Victor* persisted in spite of the Admonitions given him, *Ireneus* would have thought himself bound to avoid Communion with him, upon the Account of the Contagion of the Schism of Co-ordination; but the early healing the Schism leaves us in the dark how far *Ireneus's* Notion, of the Contagion of Schism, would have carried him. 2. 'Tis not easy, from such extraordinary Cases as this, to determine what their settled Notions were, because they seem not to think themselves strictly tied up to them upon those Occasions, when a little receding from them would do considerable Service, and heal any great Breach: They used, in these Cases, to give way to Necessity, as, *Cyprian* says, *Cornelius* did in the Case of *Trophimus*, whom *Valesius* conjectures to have been one of the Bishops concern'd in *Novatian's* Ordination. And he speaks of this as no new Thing among them.

“ † *Nam sicut Antecessores nostri saepe fecerunt colligendis fratribus nostris, carissimus frater noster Cornelius necessitati succubuit; &c.* As 'twas often the Practice of our Predecessors in bringing our Brethren together, so our dear Brother *Cornelius* yielded to Necessity; and because the greatest Part of the People had gone off with

E 2

“ *Trophimus,*

* Adv. Hæres. lib. I. c. 13. p. 79. lib. III. c. 3. p. 204.

† Epist. ad Anton. p. 105.

“ *Trophimus*, when he return’d to the Church,
 “ and made Satisfaction, penitently confessing,
 “ and begging pardon for his former Error; and
 “ brought back the Brethren, whom he had late-
 “ ly carried off, with a thorough Humiliation
 “ and Satisfaction, his Prayers were heard, and
 “ not so much was *Trophimus* receiv’d into the
 “ Lord’s Church, as the greatest part of the Bre-
 “ thren which were with *Trophimus*; who would
 “ never have return’d to the Church, unless
 “ they had brought him in their Company.
 “ When therefore this was debated by many of
 “ our Colleagues, *Trophimus* was receiv’d; for
 “ whom the Return of the Brethren, and the Re-
 “ covery of many made Satisfaction. ” Here
 they receded from their ordinary Rules, and re-
 lax’d of their Rigour in receiving Penitents, both
 in the Case of *Trophimus* and his Schismatical Ad-
 herents; for I hardly think Schismatics would
 have met with such Favour, or have been allow’d
 to insist upon such high Terms, in other Cases.
 As therefore we cannot judge of their Notions
 and Rules about Schism, barely from what they
 did, in such an extraordinary Case, to *heal* a
 Schism; so neither can we judge of them here by
 what they did, in a more extraordinary Case, to
prevent a Schism.

I shall next consider your last Instance, because
 ’tis so like to that I have just spoke to. † *At length*
it came to pass that Pope Stephen excommu-
nicated the good Bishop Cyprian himself, and those
who adher’d to him, for rejecting the Baptism of
Heretics. Now there was manifestly a Schism of Co-
ordination, in this Case, between the opposite Parties;
and yet we don’t find, that either Side thought the Flocks
of their Adversaries obliged to forsake the Communion
of their respective Diocesans upon that Account.

BOTH

Both Sides are commonly thought to have been in the Wrong : But Pope *Stephen* was undoubtedly the Schismatic. The Question now is, what did they on both Sides think of the Contagion of Schism? And as to Pope *Stephen*, I can't see but he carried his Notion as far as any of our *Non-jurors*. For he not only excommunicated *Cyprian* and the Bishops who adher'd to him, calling *Cyprian* a false Christ, a false Apostle, and a deceitful Worker; but he refus'd as well Civil as Religious Communion with such as belong'd to him. When Messengers came from † *Cyprian*, he would not so much as speak with them, or receive them into his House; nay he forbid others to entertain them. And why did he thus treat them as Heathens, and Publicans, but because of their Communion with *Cyprian*, whom he look'd upon as cut off from the Church? Must he not then have thought *Cyprian's* Flock oblig'd to forsake his Communion? How could he more fully, than he did, declare that to be his Mind? I only ask you, Whether you don't think he would have cheerfully receiv'd any that came from *Carthage*, if they had declar'd they renounc'd Communion with *Cyprian*? And if that be true; must he not necessarily have thought it the Duty of *Cyprian's* Flock to forsake him? And now, if we consider what Apprehensions the other Side had, 'tis certain, *Firmilianus* thought, Pope *Stephen* had cut himself off from the Communion of the Church, by his Schismatical Excommunication. Nothing can be plainer than this from what he says to him, " * *Peccatum vero quam magnum tibi exaggerasti,*
 " &c. What a great Sin have you brought
 " upon your self, by cutting your self off
 " from so many Flocks? For you have cut
 your

† Epist. *Firmil.* ad *Cypr.* p. 228. * Ibid,

“ yourself off : Don’t deceive yourself. For
 “ he is truly a Schismatic, who makes him-
 “ self an Apostate from the Communion of
 “ Catholic Unity. While therefore you think
 “ all may be excommunicated by you, you
 “ have excommunicated yourself only from the
 “ Communion of all.” It does not indeed appear,
 that they of *Cyprian’s* Side were for dealing with
 all that belong’d to *Stephen*, as he did by those
 who belong’d to *Cyprian*. *Stephen* would not
 send any Messengers to them, to give them an
 Opportunity of refusing to receive them,
Cyprian’s was indeed the charitable Side, and
 tho’ stiff enough in their Opinion, were against
 excommunicating Persons for differing from
 them, and therefore would probably have been
 willing to receive any of *Stephen’s* Flock to
 Communion, while they were endeavouring,
 by friendly Messages, to reclaim *Stephen* from
 his Schismatical Proceedings, and bring him
 back to Unity and Communion with them.
 But let any one judge from that Passage I have
 cited from *Firmilian*, whether he did not look
 upon *Stephen* to be worthy to be depos’d; and
 whether ’tis not probable, that had there been
 an internal Schism upon that Occasion in the
 Church of *Rome*, he would have renounc’d
 Communion with *Stephen*, and taken part with
 the Anti-bishop. And that *Cyprian* would have
 done the same, is not I think, very unlikely
 from his Way of Writing.

THERE is one Thing considerable in this
 Schism of *Stephen*, as likewise in that of *Victor*,
 which may perhaps be the Reason, why we have
 not so full an Account of the Opinion of the
 Ancients about either of them. The Bishops,
 between whom the Schism lay, were very distant
 from

from one another, and could do little in each others Churches, to get their respective Bishops depos'd, or other Bishops ordain'd in Opposition to them, especially considering all the Bishops, and their Flocks, in each Province, were so perfectly agreed about the Points in Debate: Now this might be a Reason why they did on neither Side, so earnestly pursue their own Notions of the Contagion of Schism, as they would, if they had thought they could have done it, to any Purpose. And by the Way, I think there is this Defect in these and all the other Instances of Schism you mention; that they were between Bishops of different Provinces.

I PROCEED now to the Schism, you mention, of *Marcianus*. The Case was thus: * *Marcianus*, Bishop of *Arles*, own'd *Novatian* the Anti-Pope of *Rome* and his Heresy. Hereupon some of the People separated from him; and *Faustinus*, Bishop of *Lyons*, sent to *Cyprian* and Pope *Stephen* to get him depos'd, and another Bishop placed in his Room. *Cyprian* having receiv'd this Letter, writes to *Stephen* (I suppose, as a nearer Bishop) to declare, as he did himself, against him, and to send Letters to the People at *Arles* and to the Bishops of *Provence*, to have another Bishop chosen and ordain'd instead of *Marcianus*. So that here was a Separation of some of the Flock from *Marcianus*, for his being guilty of a Schism of Co-ordination, and that before he was depriv'd by any Synodical Censure, or another put in his Room; and this approv'd by *Cyprian*. Nothing can more exactly agree with the Case of the *Non-jurors*, according as you have stated it. And now I think it proper to look back to your Challenge, where you say; † *And I fairly Challenge those who*
would

* Cypr. Epist. 68. † Pag. 17.

would seem to pay such a Deference to Antiquity, to produce so much as one Fact to the contrary. I beseech them to shew me, if they can, that any one Flock was encouraged to forsake the Communion of their Diocesan, merely for his having communicated with a Schismatical Intruder in a neighbouring See, or for being upon any other Account chargeable with the Schism of Co-ordination. I confess, if a Bishop had been depos'd for his Schism of Co-ordination, the Flocks were obliged to adhere to the new Bishop in Opposition to their late Schismatical One. But I defy any Man to shew, that a Flock could be justified by the Principles of Antiquity, in separating from their own Bishops Communion merely for his being guilty of the Schism of Co-ordination, before he was depos'd, or before any other Bishop was ordained to preside over them. I dare say you will own, I have fully answer'd this Challenge, if I make good what I have asserted of the Case of Marcianus. And, believe me, I'll do it to a Tittle.

I. I say, Marcianus was guilty of the Schism of Co-ordination in holding Communion with Novatian, the Schismatical Bishop of Rome. You say:
 * 'Tis certain, that he separated himself from the Communion of his neighbouring Catholic Bishops; and consequently he was undoubtedly guilty of the Schism of Co-ordination. But then you question whether he communicated with Novatian as Bishop of Rome. Nevertheless the thing is certain. For if the Expression of *Novatiano sese conjunxerit*, that he join'd himself to Novatian signified no more than his falling into his Opinion; and so left the Matter doubtful: Yet there is another Passage which absolutely determines it. I mean, where Cyprian says, "*Marcianus* has long boasted, that liking *Novatian*, and following his Opinion, he has separated himself from our Communion." "*Jampridem jactat*

“ *jaſſat & prædicat, quod Novatiano Studens, & ejus pervicaciam ſequens, a communione ſe noſtra ſegregaverit.* ” Would he boaſt, do we think thus, without holding Communion with *Novatian*? Nor can *Cyprian*’s uſing the Word *Pervicaciam* be urged to weaken this Argument. For that, without doubt, is *Cyprian*’s own invidious Turn given to *Marcianus*’s Words, who had uſed *ſententiam*, or ſome like Word inſtead of it. And indeed it would be unaccountable, that *Marcianus* ſhould ſeparate himſelf from the Catholics upon the Account of that Opinion they held in oppoſition to *Novatian*, and yet not hold Communion with *Novatian*.

II. WHEN *Cyprian* wrote that Letter to *Stephen*, *Marcianus* was not depriv’d by any ſynodical Censure, nor was any other Biſhop ordain’d in his Room. Indeed *Cyprian*’s Letter is to deſire *Stephen* to ſend to the Biſhops in *Gaul*, to depoſe him, and place another in his Stead. Hear *Cyprian*: “ *Quapropter facere te oportet pleniffimas literas, &c.* ” Wherefore you ought to write moſt fully to our Fellow-Biſhops in *Gaul*, that they would not ſuffer the obſtinate and proud *Marcianus*, the Enemy of Piety towards God, and the Salvation of the Brethren, any longer to inſult our College [that is of Catholic Biſhops] becauſe he does not yet ſeem excommunicated by us.” And again afterwards he ſays; “ Let Letters be directed from you into *Provence*, and to the People at *Arles*, that *Marcianus* being excommunicated, another may be placed in his Room, and the Flock of Chriſt may be gather’d, which hitherto is deſpiſed, being by him ſcatter’d and wounded.” The ſame may be confirm’d by another Paſſage, if rightly underſtood; tho’ I ſuppoſe that led you into the contrary Opinion. “ Let *Marcianus* [ſays he] not paſs Sentence, but receive it; nor let him act as tho’ he were to
F “ judge

“ judge the College of Priests, since he is judg’d by the Priests universally.” Now in this Passage, *Cyprian* does not speak of any Judgment pass’d upon *Marcianus* in particular, but only of the Judgment that had already pass’d upon *Novatian*, to whom *Marcianus* had join’d himself; and in whose Condemnation *Marcianus* was in effect, condemn’d likewise. This Condemnation of *Novatian* he takes particular Notice of before in the Letter; and he would without Doubt have mention’d the particular Condemnation of *Marcianus*, had there been any such thing: But the contrary is plain by other Expressions of the Epistle. Besides in what other Sense could *Cyprian* say, *Marcianus* was judg’d by all the Priests *ab universis sacerdotibus judicatus*, but only as they had all condemn’d him in condemning *Novatian*? His Case was of a longer standing, happening Five Years before, and it had made a great Noise thro’ the World, and had been universally condemn’d; but *Marcianus*’s Case was but then in Agitation. So that here was a Bishop guilty of the Schism of Co-ordination without being depriv’d, or having another placed in his Room.

III. I AFFIRM, That some of the People at *Arles* were at that Time separated from *Marcianus*, and that *Cyprian* approv’d of their Practice. And to prove this, I shall only translate one Passage of his Letter. *Idcirco enim, frater carissime, copiosum corpus est sacerdotum concordiae mutuae glutino atq; unitatis vinculo copulatum, &c.* Therefore is the numerous Body of Priests join’d together with the Band of mutual Concord and Unity, that if any of our College should attempt to broach a Heresy, and to tear or waste the Flock of CHRIST, the rest may come in to their Help, and as useful and merciful Shepherds, may gather the Lord’s Sheep into his Flock. For what if a Port begins to be dangerous for Ships, its Works being broken;

“ ken; should not Seamen sail to other Ports,
 “ where they have a safe Entrance, and a secure
 “ Harbour? Or if an Inn upon the Road comes
 “ to be in the Hands of Robbers, so that whoever
 “ goes into it, is made a Prey to them, laying wait
 “ for him; don’t Travellers, when they know it,
 “ go to other Inns, where there is more safe
 “ and hospitable Entertainment? In like manner
 “ should it be now with us, Dear Brother, we
 “ should readily and kindly receive our Brethren,
 “ who having *avoided the Rocks of Marcianus come*
 “ *to the safe Ports of the Church*, and should accom-
 “ modate these Travellers with such an Inn as that
 “ mention’d in the † GOSPEL, where they being
 “ wounded, by Thieves, may be receiv’d, and
 “ cherish’d, and kept in Safety by the Host.

NEXT you mention two other || Schisms of
Basilides and *Martialis*. These were two Spanish
 Bishops, who had been guilty of Idolatry, upon
 which their Churches forsook them. *Basilides*
 profess’d his Repentance, and was glad to com-
 municate as a Layman; and so *Sabinus* was or-
 dain’d Bishop in his Stead. *Martialis* seems to
 have neither resign’d, nor to have been synodi-
 cally deposed: However his Case being plain,
Felix was ordain’d in his Room. *Basilides* some
 Time after went to *Rome*, and there impos’d up-
 on poor Pope *Stephen*, and got him to own him,
 and then went and set up again for Bishop of
 his old See. *Martialis* used some fraudulent
 Dealing also; it seems not improbable, but is not
 certain, that he went to *Rome* with *Basilides*:
 However, he pretended likewise to his old Bi-
 shoprick. The People of both Churches adher’d
 to their new Bishops, and sent them to *Cyprian*
 for his Advice. *Cyprian* hereupon commended
 the People for what they had done, and justifies

F 2

their

their forsaking their old Bishops. The Case of *Martialis* comes close upon you, unless you can shew, he was depos'd by a Synodical Censure, which I think you can't do, except you suppose the Bishops who ordain'd his Successor must be understood virtually to depose him : And if that be true, any Three or Four Bishops may make a Synod when they will. 'Tis certain *Cyprian* lays no Stress upon any Thing but his Wickedness ; and his whole Argument shews, he look'd upon the People to have had a Right to depose him. You say ; *St. Cyprian tells us some of his Collegues did notwithstanding Communicate with Basilides and Martialis : And this Phrase denotes such Bishops as he profess'd himself in Communion with.* This is plausible, but not satisfactory. It shews *Cyprian* thought there might be such a Case, wherein the Schism of Co-ordination might not be a sufficient Ground of Deposing a Bishop ; But then what was that Case ? Only when a Bishop held Communion with a Schismatical Bishop, being impos'd upon and deceiv'd by a false Relation of Matter of Fact, that is, of the State of the Schism. And really it would have been hard, had *Cyprian* thought Pope *Stephen* deserv'd to be depos'd for a wrong Judgment given upon the Case of a Bishop misrepresented to him ; when *Cyprian* himself was liable to the same. For *Cyprian* seems to have heard only one Side, as *Stephen* did the other. This Apology *Cyprian* makes for *Stephen* in the Case of *Basilides*. “ *Romam pergens Stephanum collegam nostrum longe positum, gestæ rei ac tacitæ veritatis ignarum fefellit.*” He went to Rome, and deceiv'd our Colleague *Stephen*, who liv'd at a great Distance, and was ignorant of Matter of Fact, and of the Truth which was conceal'd from him.” It seems reasonable to allow, there should be somewhat more of Wilfulness necessary to make a Man a Schismatic,

tic, as well as a Heretic, than what was in *Stephen's* Case; I mean, he should be guilty of somewhat worse than a Mistake in Matter of Fact. However, as the Thing had an ill Tendency, *Cyprian* passes a severe Censure upon him, though he takes off much of the *Odium* of it by not speaking of him by Name, but speaks in the Plural. For by the Collegues he refers to, I understand, *Stephen* alone to be intended; which is a way of speaking usual with the Apostle *Paul*, and many other Writers.

† THERE is another Passage you mention in that Epistle, as an Objection against your Scheme; and 'tis indeed an unanswerable One; which I shall therefore endeavour to confirm. I shall set down the Place presently, but would first take notice of your Remark upon it. Now, say you, *Schism is a most heinous Sin, and consequently, in St. Cyprian's Judgment, the Flock ought to separate from their Bishop, if he becomes a Schismatic. But I would fain ask the Non-jurors, whether they will care to own, that this Proposition of St. Cyprian is universally true, viz. That a Flock must separate from their Bishop if he becomes a wicked Man; or what Reason they can give, why a Flock must separate from their Bishop, if his Wickedness be the Schism of Coordination; although they need not separate from him, if his Wickedness be of another Nature, suppose Murder or Drunkenness.* I will not pretend to answer for the *Non-jurors*; but I will for *Cyprian*, That his Opinion was, the People were to forsake a Bishop, if he was guilty of such Crimes you mention, or of Idolatry. And I would only desire any Man that questions it, to read that Epistle for his Conviction. Let me therefore shew how the Passage you cite is brought in. The Letter is writ in the Name of *Cyprian* and 36 other Bishops

shops. " When we were met together [say they]
 " we read the Letters which, according to the
 " Sincerity of your Faith and your Fear of GOD,
 " you sent us by our Fellow-Bishops *Felix* and *Sa-*
 " *binus*, wherein you tell us *Basilides* and *Mar-*
 " *tialis*, having accepted Libels to testify their
 " joining in the Heathen Idolatry, and being
 " guilty of grievous Crimes, ought not to be Bi-
 " shops, or minister in the Priesthood : And you
 " have desir'd an Answer from us, that you may
 " be comforted and assisted by our Judgment in
 " the just and necessary Care you have taken.
 " But this, your Desire, is not so much answer-
 " ed by our Advice as by the Divine Precepts,
 " by which it was long ago order'd in the Law
 " of GOD, what kind of Men should serve at
 " the Altar, and perform the Sacrifices." Here-
 upon they cite *Exod.* xix. 22. xxx. 21. *Lev.* xxi. 17.
 These are *the Divine Precepts* they talk of, which
 have no particular Regard to Schism, but to Im-
 morality in general. Then they go on : " Now
 " since these Things are made known aforehand,
 " and are manifest, 'tis necessary our Obedience
 " should be paid to the Divine Precepts: Nor
 " can Men authorize the accepting Mens Per-
 " sons in such Things, or make Allowance to
 " any one, where a Divine Order comes in the
 " Way, and has given a Law." Their Meaning
 plainly is : There is no need of the Advice of any
 Bishop, or the Order of any Synod, when GOD
 has already given such an express and clear Order
 in the Case. They then cite *Isai.* xxix. 13.
 taking Notice of CHRIST's repeating it, *Mark.*
 vii. 13. and add : " Having these Things be-
 " fore our Eyes, and religiously considering
 " them in the Ordinations of Priests, we ought
 " to chuse none but spotless and upright Bishops,
 " who may holily and worthily offer Sacrifices
 " to God, and be heard in those Prayers they make
 " for

“ for the Safety of the Lord’s People: Since ’tis
 “ written, *God bears not a Sinner; but if any Man*
 “ *worship him, and do his Will, him he beareth.* Up-
 “ on which Account such are, upon a diligent and
 “ thorough Inquiry, to be chosen into the Priest-
 “ hood, as, ’tis certain, are heard by GOD. Nor
 “ let the People flatter themselves, as tho’ they
 “ could be unhurt by the Contagion of the Sin of
 “ a wicked Priest, when they communicate with
 “ him, and give their Consent to the unjust and
 “ unlawful Episcopacy of him that is set over
 “ them; since the Divine Censure threatens them
 “ by the Prophet * *Hosea*, and says, Their Sa-
 “ crifices are as the Bread of Mourning, all that
 “ eat of them shall be polluted. Whereby he
 “ plainly teaches us, that all are certainly involv’d
 “ in his Sin, who are polluted with the Sacri-
 “ fice of a prophane and unrighteous Priest.
 “ Which we likewise find plainly declar’d in
 “ *Numbers*, when *Korah, Dathan and Abiram* as-
 “ sum’d to themselves, in Opposition to *Aaron*,
 “ the Liberty of sacrificing. There the LORD
 “ commanded, by *Moses*, that the People should
 “ be separate from them, lest, being join’d with
 “ wicked Men, they also in the same Wickedness
 “ should be punish’d. Be ye separated [says he]
 “ from the Tents of those wicked Men, and touch
 “ nothing that belongs to them, lest you perish with
 “ them in their Sin.” Now follows the Passage you
 “ cite. “ For which Reason the People obeying the
 “ Divine Precepts, and fearing God, ought to sepa-
 “ rate themselves from a wicked Ruler, and not to
 “ have to do with the Sacrifices of a villanous
 “ Priest; since they, especially, have the Power
 “ of chusing worthy Priests, and of rejecting those
 “ that are unworthy.” Now if *Cyprian* and these
 Bishops do not here declare their Opinion, that
 the

† *Hosea ix. 4.*

the People have a Right to leave a wicked Bishop; they can have no Meaning at all, and their Epistle must be the most impertinent Thing in the World. What are these *Divine Precepts* they talk of but Scripture Rules? What a shameful Remark then is that of *Rigaltius*, which the Bishop of Oxford has set down from him upon this Place. “ Not, says he, that the People were to do this of themselves, but being admonish’d by the just and necessary Care of other Rulers, the Bishops of other Churches, whose Advices answer to Divine Precepts. ” How directly contrary is this to the manifest Sense of those Bishops, and how unworthy of so just a Critic as † *Rigaltius* ordinarily is? The People were, according to the Judgment of this Synod, to forsake such wicked Bishops and Priests by Virtue of a Divine Precept, whether a Synod did or did not censure or depose them. And indeed there is no mention in the Epistle of any deposing or depriving of *Martialis*, beside the Peoples forsaking him and chusing another. Of *Basilides* they say, he was justly depos’d [*juste depositus*] but they presently after shew by whom he was depos’d; that it was *Basilides*’s own Act; that being wounded in his own Conscience, of his own Accord he laid down his Office: *Episcopatum pro conscientiae suae vulnere sponte deponens*. I have the rather taken so much Notice of this, that you may see what Reason a great Part of the Dissenters have, according to the Judgment of this Synod, to separate as they do, upon the Account of the scandalous Lives of the Priests; tho’ we don’t herein so much regard their Judgment, as we do the Divine Precepts; *Matth. vii. 15.*

I SHALL be brief upon the rest of your Chapters. In your Fifth, you answer an Argument of the *Non-jurors*, that Dr. *Compton* was excommunicated

ipso

† Comp. *Cyprian. Epist. 65. ad Epictet.*

ipso facto by the second Canon, because he thereby deny'd or impeach'd the Ecclesiastical Authority or Supremacy of King *James II.* or of the present *Pretender*, whom they call King *James III.* and therefore all in his Diocese were bound to separate from him and disown his Authority. Now here you insist upon it, that the Canon does not mean, a Person is actually excommunicated before any formal Sentence. (And I confess, I have had the same Notion you have of those Excommunications *ipso facto*. But however I think One may move these Three Queries upon the Canon.

I. DOES it not plainly appear by this Canon, that *Dr. Compton* deserv'd Excommunication, according to the *Non-jurors* Principles, upon the Supposition of the Truth of which you argue?

II. DO you not believe, that *Dr. Compton* would have been actually deposed and excommunicated, if a free Synod had examin'd his Conduct, according to the Old Principles of the Church of *England*, which the *Non-jurors* adhere to, and you allow them?

III. CAN such a Person be look'd upon fit to be communicated with, and obey'd as a Bishop, who has notoriously done what the Canons declare deserves Excommunication, and who had been certainly excommunicated, had there been a free Synod to proceed against him?

I SHALL only add; tho' the *Non-jurors* mistake the Meaning of such Excommunications, yet they are not the only Persons who do so. There are many of the other Clergy of their Mind; who therefore can't satisfy themselves with your Answer. Such are all they who think,

that barely by Virtue of such * Excommunications the Clergy are warrant'd to refuse to read Prayers at the Burial of any Dissenters; which I would not be understood to speak of in a Way of Complaint upon our own Account, who can be very easy without their Favour, and pity their Uncharitableness.

YOUR Sixth Chapter is only a Summing up your Argument. Your Seventh is concerning *The pretended Immorality of your Prayers.* And, no doubt, this Immorality is only pretended, and not real; since it only lies in Praying for the present Government. Now all that you attempt here, is, to shew, how Persons may, as Laymen, be innocently present at such Prayers. You don't endeavour to vindicate Clergymens reading those Prayers, or Peoples joining with them, but only their being present without saying *Amen* to the Prayers for the Government. Now I think your Discourse is here very defective. The *Non-jurors* may be suppos'd not only to think the Prayers to be contrary to the Doctrine of the Church of *England*, to the second Canon, and to the Declaration she requir'd Her Clergy to subscribe by the *Act of Uniformity*; but may carry their Notion much farther according to the first of the Canons of 1640, and look upon these very Prayers as *treasonable against God as well as against the King.* And certainly you have not then said enough to justify their being present, where they knew such Prayers would be used. Besides, as they think the Prayers unlawful to be read by a Clergyman, they may well think they have most Reason to join with such Clergymen as leave them out, and whom they look upon as unjustly depriv'd for refusing to swear agreeably to them. And doubtless you will do much better Service to your Church,

* *Vide The Clergyman's Vade Mecum. Part I. p. 170.*

Church, by confuting this pretended Immorality of your Prayers, and by vindicating the Right of King GEORGE, than by contriving Shifts and Artifices, by the Help of which, Men may salve their Consciences, in being present at them, upon the Supposition of their Immorality.

YOUR Eighth Chapter is to shew, *That the Non-jurors Separation from the Communion of Bishop Robinson, is Schismatical.* This Chapter goes upon what you presume has been done by the *Non-jurors*. And as I think many of the Things you presume, are reasonable enough; so I think the Conduct of that Party might have led you to have presum'd many more. However, an Argument built upon such doubtful Guesses can't be very certain. You suppose the depriv'd Bishops consecrated Suffragans for their other Dioceses, as well as they did Dr. *Hickes* for that of *Norwich*, and that a Succession of Non-juring Bishops has been continu'd among us. And you say, *Because you are arguing upon the Principles of the Non-jurors, therefore you will grant, that the Depriv'd Bishops had even after Deprivation, a Right to consecrate Suffragans for their own Dioceses.* The *Non-jurors* are not much oblig'd to you for granting them this, which your own Principles necessitate you to hold; namely, because those Bishops were never depriv'd by Synodical Censure. And the *Spiritual Action* of a Consecration can be no more null'd by an Act of Parliament, than by *suppos'd Want of a Rightful Prince's Nomination*. But why might you not suppose, that those depriv'd Bishops, by Virtue of some secret Commission from King *James*, depriv'd the Bishops that took the Oaths, and consecrated others in their Stead. If Dr. *Hickes* Consecration could be kept so secret for above seventeen Years, who knows what may yet come to Light hereafter? And why may it not be presum'd that Dr. *Hickes*, and the other Suffra-

gans, if they were ordain'd during the Lives of their respective Diocesans, had it express'd both in King *James's* Order, and at their Consecration, that they were appointed Suffragans and Successors to their Diocesans? Or, if they were consecrated upon the Demise of their Diocesans, why may they not be understood to take the Title of Suffragans only upon a Prudential Consideration, to avoid the Danger of a *Præmunire*? Or, why might not King *James*, in Complaisance to the *Non-jurors*, and the more to encourage them, change the Sees of the several Dioceses, as from *Norwich* to *Thetford*, and the like? In this Case, the Suffragan of *Thetford* must be look'd upon, according to the Principles upon which you argue, as the Bishop of the Diocese of *Norwich*, and the Suffragan of *Dover*, as the Archbishop of *Canterbury*. And now suppose there was a Suffragan of *Colchester* too, that is, another beside Dr. *Robinson* pretending to the Bishoprick of *London*, how will you maintain the Title of the latter according to your own Concessions? Besides, I would fain know, how you are sure, they understand *Suffragans* in the same Sense you do. You suppose Dr. *Hickes* styl'd himself Suffragan of *Thetford*, meaning he was Suffragan to the Bishop of *Norwich*; but why may he not as well be understood to intend that he was Suffragan of the Archbishop of *Canterbury*. For you are sensible all the Bishops of a Province are reckon'd the Archbishop's Suffragans. I will not enlarge upon the Consequences of these Things, because I own they are but Speculations.

SEVERAL Things in your last Chapter have fallen in my Way already. I shall therefore be brief here likewise. You say; † *As for those Dioceses whose Bishops were depriv'd, whatever might have been*

been pleaded whilst the depriv'd Bishops themselves were alive ; yet since that Personal Contest is at an End, and the Schism of Co-ordination is perfectly ceased (because the deprived Bishops are dead ; and those who were consecrated by th depriv'd ones, or derive their Succession from them, do not pretend to be other than Suffragans) therefore those Bishops that have been elected, and consecrated, and publickly and unanimously own'd by their Comprovincials, as Bishops of those once controverted Sees, are now, by all the Rules of Ecclesiastical Discipline, (and particularly St. Cyprian whom the Non-jurors love to magnify) the only lawful Bishops of them. I have already hinted a Reason, why I think you ought not to argue from the Non-jurors using the Title of Suffragans. To which I might add, that the Suffragans may possibly have Diocesans of their own Kidney, whose Suffragans they are ; But I Query, Whether the Schismatical Ordination of an Anti-bishop is not null ? And in my Mind this is not a Personal Contest that ceases upon the Death of either Party. Give me leave, Sir, to use an Argument here, which you may possibly like the better for its being so like one of your own. I say then, you cannot allow those, the Non-jurors and yourself take to be Schismatical Intruders into the Dioceses of the depriv'd Bishops, to be at any time the Rightful Bishops of those Dioceses. For if they are, it must be by Virtue of somewhat before or after the Death of the depriv'd Bishops ; Not any thing before, because then there must have been two Bishops of the same Diocese at the same time, which is contrary to a fundamental Maxim of the Episcopal Scheme : Not after their Death ; for what had they after which they had not before ? If their Election, Consecration, &c. made them Bishops of those Dioceses, they must have been so before the Death of the Depriv'd ones. And since you grant they were not before the Death of the Depriv'd, and nothing new happen'd

happen'd to 'em at their Death, they cannot thereupon become the Rightful Bishops. And *Cyprian* speaks of no such Case as this. Nor can you, I believe, produce any one Instance in the ancient Times of a Schismatical Anti-bishop's being reckon'd a rightful one, upon the Death of him who was so in his Life time. I speak of the three first Centuries. For I grant somewhat of this Nature may be met with afterwards: But then it was upon a preceding Compact for the healing of a Schism. And in that Case the Schismatical Person became reconcil'd to the Church, and was no Schismatic, when he whom he succeeded, died. Now nothing of this Nature can be pretended in the present Case.

UPON the whole, Sir, I think I have shewn, you cannot defend the present Publick Assemblies of the Church of *England* upon your Principles; and that here is a Necessity of your revoking the Concessions you have made the *Non-jurors*, if you would do any Service to the Church; for as for the Government, I can't perceive you design'd it any. And after all the Noise of your *Jus Divinum*, it seems impossible to defend the Church, without supposing it to be a Parliamentary Church, and that, the same Power that makes Bishops can unmake them also.

YOU will bear with me likewise, if I tell you, I apprehend the Truth must lie on our Side, or the *Non-jurors*. If the Doctrines of *Passive Obedience* and *Non-Resistance* are true; the *Non-jurors* are certainly in the Right, and the Clergy are Schismatical in renouncing them, and forsaking their Brethren who stick by them: If these Doctrines are (as they doubtless are) notoriously false, the Church of *England* was Schismatical in espousing them, and in rejecting us in 1662. because we would not declare our Assent to them. You may chuse which you please.

EXCUSE me if I beseech you, Sir, not to be in

a Wrath with us *Fanaticks*, if we don't shew ourselves displeas'd, when we see this Controversy about Schism brought to such an Issue. For 'tis to be hoped, the present Government, which cannot consistently with their own Safety encourage the *Non-jurors*, will now see the present establish'd Clergy cannot possibly defend themselves without owning we were in the Right in 1662. in opposing such pernicious Doctrines, as were then made Terms of our keeping in ; and consequently the Schism did not lie on our Side then, and we have had very hard Usage since. And I heartily pray God, the present Providence may have this good Effect, to open the Eyes of the Nation, and let all Men into a right Understanding of the true State of our Case.

You may perhaps expect, as I have shewn the Weakness of your Arguments, I should now myself deal with the *Non-jurors*, and lay before them proper Arguments to convince them of the Unreasonableness of their making any Difficulty in falling in with the present Government. But in this I think I am happily prevented by a Clergy-Man of the Church of *England*, who has, in my Apprehension, unanswerably confuted the Principles of the *Non-jurors*. I mean the very ingenious Author of the *Answer to the Non-jurors Charge of Schism upon the Church of England* ; from whom they will be more likely to receive Conviction than from a Dissenter ; tho' I can't see his Principles are much different from mine. I confess, I could not read your Treatise, without some Indignation, when I saw how you gave up the Revolution, and the present Government ; and I was willing to convince those who are dispos'd fairly and impartially to consider Things, that there is no possibility of vindicating the Church of *England* in its present Constitution, upon such shuffling Principles. If, upon my laying these open, I have given

ven any Satisfaction to your self, or shall be an Oc-
 casion to others to act honourably, and to shew
 themselves in their proper Colours; I shall reckon
 I have done the Government good Service, and
 that there is no Loss of the Labour of him, who is
 desirous of approving himself,

SIR,

Exon. Nov.

13. 1716.

Your Sincere Friend and Servant

JAMES PEIRCE,



In the Press.

A VINDICATION of the DISSENTERS;
 In Answer to Dr. *William Nichol's* Defence of the Doc-
 trine, and Discipline of the Church of England: In
 Three Parts. The I. containing, an Historical Account
 of the Controversy, and the Persecutions which the Dis-
 senters have suffer'd, from the Beginning of the Reformation, &c.
 The II. relating to Matters of Doctrine; as Popish Errors,
 and the Doctrine of Passive Obedience, and Non-resistance,
 &c. The III. being a System of the whole Controversy,
 upon the following Heads: 1. Bishops; 2. Deans and Chap-
 ters; 3. Cathedral Worship; 4. Forms of Prayer; 5. The
 Cross in Baptism; 6. Godfathers, and Godmothers; 7. Con-
 firmation; 8. The Surplice; 9. The Ring in Marriage; 10.
 Kneeling at the Sacrament; 11. Holy Days; 12. Bowing at
 the Name of Jesus, and toward the Altar; 13. Reading the
 Apocrypha; 14. Homilies; 15. The Faults in the Litur-
 gy; 16. The Discipline of the Church of England. Writ-
 ten first in Latin, and now translated into English, with
 large Additions: By Mr. JAMES PEIRCE. 8vo.